1 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 9 10 CHRISTOPHER L. HEBARD, an individual, and COTO SETTLEMENT, a corporation, 11 CASE NO. C08-125RSM Plaintiff. 12 ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS FEES 13 IAN EISENBERG, an individual, and OLYMPIC 14 COMMUNICATIONS, INC., a corporation, 15 Defendants. 16 17 This matter is before the Court for consideration of defendants' motion for attorneys fees and 18 costs. Dkt. # 64. The motion is brought pursuant to RCW 4.84.185, which provides: 19 In any civil action, the court having jurisdiction may, upon written findings by the judge that the action . . . was frivolous and advanced without reasonable cause, require the nonprevailing 20 party to pay the prevailing party the reasonable expenses, including fees of attorneys, incurred in opposing such action . . . This determination shall be made upon motion by the prevailing 21 party after a voluntary or involuntary order of dismissal, order on summary judgment, final judgment after trial, or other final order terminating the action as to the prevailing party. The 22 judge shall consider all evidence presented at the time of the motion to determine whether the position of the nonprevailing party was frivolous and advanced without reasonable cause. In 23 no event may such motion be filed more than thirty days after entry of the order. 24 RCW 4.84.185. The statute grants the Court discretion to award attorneys' fees on actions brought 25 under Washington State law, when the Court finds that the action was frivolous and advanced without 26 reasonable cause. See, e.g., Skimming v. Boxer, 119 Wash. App. 748, 754 (Div. III, 2004). 27

28

ORDER - 1

This action was dismissed upon a Rule 12(b)(6) motion for failure to state a claim, after the Court determined that it was barred by the applicable statute of limitations. Dk.t # 56. In the dismissal Order, the Court characterized plaintiff's assertions as "retrospective rationalizations," but did not find that the action was either frivolous or "advanced without reasonable cause." *Id.* The Court declines to do so now.

Accordingly, defendants' motion for attorneys' fees pursuant to RCW 4.84.185 is DENIED. Defendants may apply separately to the Clerk of Court for taxation of costs pursuant to F.R.Civ.Proc. 54(d)(1).

DATED this 6 Day of January 2009.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE